UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
22nd meeting
held on
Thursday, 29 October 1992
at 10 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 22nd MEETING

Chairman:	Mr. ELARABY	(Egypt)
later:	Mr. PATOKALLIO (Vice-Chairman)	(Finland)

CONTENTS

- Consideration of draft resolutions under all disarmament and international security items

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

92-61676 2473V (E)

DISTR. GENERAL
A/C.1/47/PV.22
27 November 1992

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 49 to 65, 68 and 142; and 67 and 69 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to the second phase of its work. As members are well aware, this and the other meetings scheduled for the period 29 October to 11 November have been set aside for the introduction of and comments on draft resolutions.

Mr. KRASULIN (Russian Federation): By resolution 45/58 O of 4 December 1990 the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General, with the assistance of qualified governmental experts and taking into account the views of Member States and other relevant information, to undertake a study of defensive-security concepts and policies to be submitted to the General Assembly at its forty-seventh session.

It gives me great pleasure, in my capacity as chairman of the group of governmental experts established to undertake a study of defensive security concepts and policies, to address the Committee this morning and to introduce the results of our work, which are reported in document A/47/394.

The study was unanimously approved by the group of experts, which consisted, in addition to myself, of experts from Argentina, Egypt, France, Germany, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Netherlands, Nigeria and Poland. I wish to take this opportunity to express my deepest appreciation to all my colleagues in the group, not only for the invaluable contribution that they made to the successful conclusion of our work but also for the support that they extended to me personally.

(Mr. Krasulin, Russian Federation)

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I should like to refer to some of the main features of the study. But, first, I wish to recall two particular paragraphs of General Assembly resolution 45/58 O, which called for the study. In my view, those two paragraphs best describe how the present study may contribute to a better understanding of the various defensive-security concepts and policies that have emerged in the past few years and of the way in which these concepts and policies may, in turn, contribute to the strengthening of international peace and security.

(Mr. Krasulin, Russian Federation)

In paragraph 1 of the resolution, the General Assembly considered:

"... the development of an international dialogue on defensive security concepts and policies to be of great importance for promoting the process of achieving disarmament and strengthening international security". (resolution 45/58 O, para.1)

In paragraph 2, the General Assembly invited:

"... Member States to initiate or intensify the dialogue on defensive security concepts and policies at the bilateral level, particularly at the regional level and, where appropriate, at the multilateral level". (resolution 45/58 O, para.2)

Indeed, the Group of Experts understood its task as one of exploring ideas, concepts and situations with a view to increasing the interest of the international community in an approach to security that deserved special consideration because of its emphasis on a defensive rather than an offensive approach, and on military, as well as political, elements.

The various models, concepts, ideas and theorems that emerged in the 1980s and that stress the importance of emphasizing defence are summarized in the report with a view to determining their value to the study as a whole. The main assumptions, arguments and conclusions of the proponents of such proposals as "non-offensive defence", "non-provocative defence", "defensive defence", "reasonable sufficiency" and so on are presented.

Because all of those models emphasize military considerations, the conclusion reached by the Group of Experts is that "defensive security", as defined in the study, goes beyond all these notions. It encompasses both political and military elements aimed at ensuring that all States conduct

(Mr. Krasulin, Russian Federation)

their policies in conformity with the Charter and adopt a military posture and a level of forces that, while ensuring an effective defence, pose no threat to other States.

As a working tool, "defensive security" is defined in the study as:

"... a condition of peace and security attained step-by-step and sustained through effective and concrete measures in the political and military fields under which:

(a) Friendly relations among States are established and maintained;

(b) Disputes are settled in a peaceful and equitable manner and the resort to force is consequently excluded;

(c) The capacity for launching a surprise attack and for initiating large-scale offensive action is eliminated through verifiable arms control and disarmament, confidence- and security-building measures and a restructuring of armed forces towards a defensive orientation."

(A/47/394, para.12)

The study discusses the question how States might best accomplish this purpose and stresses, in particular, that the modalities of defensive security policies will, in practice, depend on the security situation prevailing in each particular region and the perceptions of the States concerned in this regard.

The study begins by exploring recent events and current trends in the international security environment that may have made this environment more conducive to the realization of defensive security.

In chapter II, it surveys recent, positive trends in Europe, including the emergence of cooperation in the wake of the cold war, and it highlights achievements in the area of arms limitation and disarmament. The report further examines the enhanced role that has emerged for regional cooperation

(Mr. Krasulin, Russian Federation)

and the United Nations in various regions and subregions in the world. Finally, the chapter also draws attention to existing and emerging threats to security.

Chapter III discusses the substance and main features of defensive security concepts and policies. It surveys the literature on non-offensive defence that became prominent in Europe during the last decade and examines proposals developed in other parts of the world, particularly those relating to weapons of mass destruction, which are relevant to defensive security. Having surveyed some of those models, concepts and ideas, the report turns next to examining the aims, substance and main features of defensive security. In doing so, it suggests what political and military considerations should be emphasized in defensive security.

In chapter IV, the report turns to some of the problems confronting the implementation of defensive security policies. These focus on the difficulty of distinguishing between offensive and defensive weapons and weapons systems, the requirement to retain the ability to conduct counter-offensives at the tactical and operational level of military operations to ensure an effective defence, and the potential difficulties posed by the joint commitment of States to collective defence. The applicability of defensive security concepts and policies at the bilateral, regional and global levels is also examined.

Strategies and measures for promoting defensive security are examined in chapter V. The measures identified for this purpose include collective security and regional cooperative arrangements consistent with the Charter; confidence- and security-building measures; arms limitation and disarmament agreements, and verification of compliance. In each case, examples are

(Mr. Krasulin, Russian Federation)

provided of ways in which States might be able to promote defensive security at a bilateral level, within specific regions or globally.

Finally, the report concludes by examining a number of measures which States might wish to adopt that might contribute or lead towards the realization of defensive security concepts and policies. In this connection, while the report once again underscores the fact that there are no ready-made, universally applicable formulas for promoting defensive security, it nevertheless identifies certain steps that all States can take towards the implementation of defensive security. Foremost among these is respect for the principles and provisions of collective security embodied in the Charter.

Once again I turn to General Assembly resolution 45/58 O and the importance it attached to the creation of an international dialogue on defensive security concepts and policies, be it at the bilateral, regional or global level. If the present study can effectively contribute to generating an informed dialogue on the subject, we, in the Group of Experts, will be truly gratified that our efforts have not been in vain.

I would like to inform the Committee that the regional sponsors of General Assembly resolution 45/58 O and the participants in the Group of Experts are working on an appropriate draft resolution, which will be circulated shortly. I should like, on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution to express the hope that it will be adopted by consensus.

Mr. VASQUEZ (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): I am pleased to present the draft decision in document A/C.1/47/L.7 under agenda item 61 (m), "Conventional disarmament on a regional scale". Under this text, the Assembly would recall decision 46/412 of 6 December 1991 and would decide to welcome the report of the Secretary-General on the question, to invite Member States that have not yet done so to convey to the Secretary-General their views on this matter, and to include in the provisional agenda of its forty-eighth session the item entitled "Conventional disarmament on a regional scale".

My delegation is awaiting additional reports from Member States in order to have sufficient information to prepare a draft resolution on this subject.

We hope that this draft decision will be adopted by the Committee by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: Since the deadline for submission of draft resolutions on disarmament agenda items has been extended until Friday, 30 October 1992, at 5 p.m., I request those delegations wishing to submit draft resolutions to transmit them to the Secretary of the Committee by the required deadline.

The meeting rose at 10.55 a.m.

UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
23rd meeting
held on
Monday, 2 November 1992
at 10 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 23rd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ELARABY (Egypt)

later: Mr. PATOKALLIO (Finland)
(Chairman)

CONTENTS

- Consideration of draft resolutions under all disarmament and international security items (continued)

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

92-61700 2508V (E)

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/47/PV.23
27 November 1992

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 49 to 65, 68 and 142; 67 and 69 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ITEMS

Mr. ARRIA (Venezuela)(interpretation from Spanish): As this is the first time that our delegation has spoken, I should like to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, and the other officers of the Committee on your election and to express to you, Sir, our special feeling of solidarity on the occasion of the tragedy that recently afflicted your country.

I should like to divide my statement into two parts. In the first part, which I shall give now, I shall offer some thoughts and ideas concerning some of the draft resolutions that have been submitted. The second part, which I shall not read but which will be distributed to delegations, is just an expression of my country's position on the agenda items.

The end of the ideological confrontation, socio-economic systems, and military and strategic interests which dominated international relations until quite recently has made it possible as never before for us to avail ourselves of extraordinary opportunities for peace and understanding among nations but at the same time, more than ever before, it has brought with it a certain level of instability. Furthermore, the transition towards new national defence policies and new regional security structures keeps the international community in a state of uncertainty with regard to collective security in the future.

In spite of the greater degree of security which is beginning to emerge thanks to this new climate of cooperation, there persist, as we all know, many risks to international peace and security such as the consequences of the arms

(Mr. Arria, Venezuela)

race, the human and material costs of disputes arising from economic and social imbalances and the resurgence and fanaticism of national and ethnic movements. The attainment for peace is not yet by any means free from difficulties, and threats persist which, because of their global implications, require shared approaches and solutions.

The nature of these threats also demonstrates that if we are to overcome them, the interests and particular views of a small number of countries are not in themselves enough if they do not incorporate the values and principles embodied in the United Nations Charter, which are shared by all nations and which today there is a historic opportunity to put into effect.

There is no doubt that the international security system should, in the future, change from the exclusively military approach, which so affected the world for almost half a century, to other approaches in which the sources of instability and threats to international peace and security are seen to derive from social, economic, humanitarian and ecological causes.

A small country such as our own, without a nuclear capacity and without any wish to acquire one, a country without a secret agenda, a country which does not export arms and whose principal objective is to consolidate the security and well-being of its people, a country which has has prompted our country to support all international disarmament efforts can, we believe, make an objective contribution to this debate.

We therefore continue to be dismayed when we see a world in which our capacity for action is restricted to efforts within the walls of this Organization and to its principles - by no means a comforting feeling. We still feel vulnerable and defenceless.

Military secrecy, something quite distinct from the strategic concept of confidentiality which is necessary for the security of a nation, continues to

(Mr. Arria, Venezuela)

stimulate over-armament. The purveyors of arms do their best to exaggerate the real offensive capacity of supposed adversaries, thus generating their own demand. Regional conflicts only benefit arms merchants, who are not under anyone's supervision, not even under the supervision of Governments in spite of the real responsibilities which they have for world instability. These Governments must shoulder their responsibilities. World public opinion is still too indulgent to these merchants and these Governments.

Now, at the end of 1992, disproportionate military expenditures continue to pose a threat to the economic security of most countries, particularly developing countries. In a world where increasing poverty constitutes a major factor for instability there would not be sufficient armaments to control the poor people of the world and forced migrations. A nation which is not developing is in no way secure. Now we know that real security can in no way be based on military force. Japan and Germany are particularly telling examples of this.

Throughout the so-called cold war the major Powers were particularly assiduous and meticulous in maintaining a kind of international accounting of nuclear weapons. It was a way of preserving the balance of terror to which the whole of humanity was subject for so many years.

(Mr. Arria, Venezuela)

Regrettably, for the developing countries such concern was lacking when it came to selling conventional arms to poor countries, with the results we are suffering from today. Undoubtedly, Somalia is the most striking example of this - a country upon which military assistance was lavished with particular generosity. Today, it is a victim of the end of the cold war, armed to the teeth and possessing more arms than food. Nobody was thinking there of balance. After all, conventional weapons could not wreak damage much beyond the frontiers of the country. Undoubtedly, this is a dangerous and irresponsible policy. Today the United Nations is attempting a programme of exchanging food for arms, because weapons have become the country's best method of payment. Comments are unnecessary.

Many of our countries must modernize their laws, which conceal the expenditure of enormous and disproportionate financial resources. If these expenditures were transparent, they would be considerably reduced, and so would the room for corruption.

National legislation which prevents States from providing information to the Register of Conventional Arms voluntarily, as was agreed at the last session of the General Assembly, should be adapted to fit this new arrangement in the international community. There is no doubt that the Register is a basic step forward in achieving more transparent accountability in the inventory of international military hardware. Our own country encounters legal limitations inherited from other times, and we are doing what we can to modify them in the light of new international circumstances. We should take advantage of this international consensus to introduce the necessary legal

(Mr. Arria, Venezuela)

reforms. Aware of this fact, Venezuela sponsored the draft resolution on the subject at the last session of the General Assembly. We are confident that the Register of conventional arms should move forward until it becomes obligatory and that it should be expanded to include inventories and production levels in all States that produce arms. It is only in this way that we can try to find out what transfers are taking place and come to know the world arms inventory. But this is precisely what we do not know today because of the lack of transparency in the area.

A world which still spends about $1,000 billion a year on armaments cannot be a safe place for anyone. The poorest part of this world still devotes $150 billion dollars a year to military expenditures. Some $40 billion is spent on the importation of arms from the industrialized world.

What is known as the "peace dividend" has generated an appreciable amount of resources which could undoubtedly be used for cooperation in international development, but everything seems to show that this will not be the case. It would seem unrealistic for developing countries like ours to expect that this saving in military expenditure on the part of major countries would be transferred and used for dealing with our enormous and overwhelming agenda of development needs.

Excessive expectations from the "peace dividend" on the part of developed countries have turned our attention - voluntarily in some cases, in others unwillingly - to the real opportunity, which is actually within our reach, of creating our own peace dividend. It is estimated we could devote some $40 billion to funding our own development, to arm ourselves with health, education and dignity - in a word, to shield ourselves and make ourselves

(Mr. Arria, Venezuela)

really safe and not to go on impoverishing ourselves with what is so rightly called excessive military hardware.

We have seen, with stupefaction, surprise and alarm, the way that the continuation of arms sales has succeeded in being justified, even the sales of material and equipment associated with nuclear activities, by using arguments based on economic considerations. According to such arguments, conversion of the military and nuclear industry is a difficult process, and for economic reasons it is necessary to continue producing and selling armaments.

I wonder what the reaction of world public opinion would be if countries sowing and producing coca, opium and marijuana were to argue that they could not replace these crops by others because they are so profitable. I am convinced that the world would not go along passively with such an argument, and rightly so. However, we have been shocked to see how the trade in arms and the tools of devastation continues to be carried on both by major and medium-sized countries. This unacceptable double standard is unquestionably immoral and hypocritical, and actively militates against world security.

Our Organization was established to promote world peace. Conventional wisdom maintains that arms are acquired to ensure peace, but we all know that the arms race which it generated unleashes a dynamic of insecurity, whence the fact that all the world buys arms. We are now emerging from this nightmare, particularly the nuclear nightmare, but we must stop the conventional arms race, which is the great nightmare, in particular of poor countries.

Peace is facilitated and secured by fewer arms. It was for this that the United Nations were established, for peacemaking and peace-keeping, and it is for this reason that we believe our Organization can do no less than invest all its commitment, energy, will and undeniable authority and prestige in halting this race against humanity. Pressure by the international community

(Mr. Arria, Venezuela)

has undoubtedly laid the groundwork for countries with a nuclear capacity to reach many important agreements shown on our disarmament agenda, but undoubtedly it has been the change in the world situation and self-interest itself and the economic limitations of these countries that have determined the depth and pace of these agreements.

We are on the right path so far as the so-called weapons of mass destruction are concerned. But where are we on this path as regards conventional weapons, arms smuggling, the black market in arms, which is the real problem of the developing countries? Nobody knows and there has never been any accounting?

My delegation believes that there is more than a window of opportunity opening up for the world, in fact a true moral and ethical opportunity to deal with the situation in a more imaginative fashion. For example, the General Assembly could elect an ombudsman who would have responsibility for investigating and denouncing all activities relating to the illegal trade in weapons. He would be a person with sufficient prestige to receive complaints and make recommendations that would have sufficient worldwide response.

The international private sector, engaged as it is in protecting its intellectual property patents, has effectively its own ombudsmen, who carry out their tasks with zeal and efficiency. Why not therefore create for ourselves a super-auditor or super-inspector in the area of the so-called "market of death", which each day costs us so much misfortune?

(Mr. Arria, Venezuela)

My delegation proposes that this suggestion be pursued further inasmuch as it is being well received. We should therefore like to draw attention to the fact that article 138 (e) of the Treaty of European Union - the Maastricht Treaty - provides for the appointment, by the European Parliament, of a fully independent ombudsman empowered to receive from any citizen or body of the European Communities complaints about maladministration or malfunctioning of organs of the Communities.

There can be no doubt that the collapse and consequent fragmentation of the Soviet Union have increased the risk of the loss of central control of equipment, experts and nuclear technology and that this situation must be treated with particular and urgent care. Nor should we forget that even those countries that are still developing nuclear programmes for civilian purposes could end up possessing the elements and the necessary technology for the production of nuclear weapons.*

The case of Iraq is perhaps the most eloquent example. Iraq, having received the broadest and most generous and diverse assistance, was able to acquire everything that it needed to become a producer of nuclear weapons. Nevertheless, many countries that sell this equipment and technology have still failed, as has the Government of Iraq, to provide the Ekeus Commission with all the necessary information. The real extent of Iraq's nuclear potential and its consequences has still to be made clear.

Furthermore, there is no doubt that the economic difficulties of new countries that possess nuclear material and equipment present the additional risk that the sale of such resources and of nuclear know-how will become

---

* Mr. Patokallio (Finland), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

Mr. Arria, Venezuela)

especially attractive. The recent capture, in Berlin, of persons who were trying to sell 5 kilograms of enriched uranium is a sufficiently serious warning to us all. Nor should we forget that Iraq signed the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons - but this did not in any way prevent it from developing its own nuclear programme: on the contrary it facilitated it.

It is neither possible nor feasible to have a nuclear balance that guarantees international peace and security in a world where, at any moment and anywhere, a new "proliferator" may appear. Only the total elimination of nuclear weapons can bring about such equilibrium. This should be the objective of the First Committee and the first task of the General Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Cameroon to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.2.

Mr. BILOA TANG (Cameroon) (interpretation from French): I have the honour and pleasure, on behalf of Angola, Burundi, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe and Zaire, of introducing draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.2, entitled "Regional confidence-building measures" under agenda item 62, "Review and implemention of the Concluding Document of the Twelfth Special Session of the General Assembly".

These 11 States of the Economic Community of Central Africa are firmly convinced that the adoption of this draft resolution by the Committee would serve to promote and strengthen the impetus necessary for the implementation of confidence-building measures in Central Africa. Indeed, this subregion has more than 80 million inhabitants grouped in States, some of which are experiencing conditions that threaten conflict in the entire region and are likely to become a serious threat to international peace and security.

(Mr. Biloa Tang, Cameroon)

Thus, it is to preserve and strengthen the harmonious relations between the peoples of these States and to remove the risk of conflicts likely to harm this positive and constructive climate that our countries have given deep thought to this matter in the context of the United Nations.

This approach, which made it possible to identify a number of confidence-building measures conducive to the realization of this objective led to the adoption by consensus - and I emphasize that it was by consensus - at the forty-sixth session of the General Assembly, of resolution 46/37 B of 6 December 1991, by which the General Assembly:

"Supports and encourages efforts aimed at promoting confidence-building measures at regional and subregional levels ...;

"Welcomes the initiative taken by the States members of the Economic Community of Central African States ..."

and requests the Secretary-General of the United Nations to continue to provide assistance by, among other actions, establishing a standing advisory commmittee to deal with security questions in Central Africa.

Here I should like to express again our gratitude to the Secretary-General, who discharged his mandate by announcing on 28 May 1992 the establishment of the Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa and the appointment of a Permanent Secretary of that Committee. Thus the meeting, at the ministerial level, of the Advisory Committee that was held in Yaounda from 27 to 31 July 1992 under the auspices of the United Nations, led to the adoption of a series of confidence-building measures in the form of a programme of work for a period.

(Mr. Biloa Tang, Cameroon)

As I said in my statement to the First Committee on 27 October, these confidence-building measures meet the concerns expressed by the Secretary-General in his report "An Agenda for Peace". They call for preventive diplomacy and the building and maintenance of peace - all of which depend upon the existence of appropriate verification measures.

The 11 States that are sponsoring draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.2 are convinced that the implementation of this programme of confidence-building measures is conducive to the climate of peace that is necessary to economic development, the first objective of which continues to be improvement of the well-being of peoples. This is why, as in the past, we ask for the support of the United Nations in the implementation of what is, for the whole of Africa, a pioneering initiative. We ardently hope that this draft resolution, like resolution 46/37 B of 6 December 1991, will be adopted by consensus.

Before concluding, I should like to mention a slight amendment to the draft resolution that I have just introduced: the reference, in the third preambular paragraph, to resolution 45/58 P of 4 December 1990 should be deleted.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Australia to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.20.

Ms. MOULES (Australia): I have the privilege to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.20, entitled "Second Review Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques" - the ENMOD Convention. In addition to Australia, the following Member States are sponsors of the draft resolution: Algeria, Argentina, Bulgaria, Canada, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia,

(Ms. Moules, Australia)

Egypt, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, the Republic of Korea, Romania, the Russian Federation, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America.

(Ms. Moules, Australia)

The Second Review Conference of the Parties to the ENMOD Convention was held in Geneva from 14 to 18 September 1992. The meeting successfully reviewed in detail the content of the Convention and conducted a comprehensive debate about its overall place in the field of disarmament and its capacity to be made relevant to contemporary circumstances. A series of engaging and interesting proposals were considered with a view to defining more clearly the scope of the Convention, improving its effectiveness, and enhancing its appeal to a wider number of countries.

The Review Conference produced an agreed Final Document, which reaffirms the strong common interest of States parties in preventing the use of environmental modification techniques for military or any other hostile purpose. In the Final Document, States parties reaffirm their strong support for the Convention, their continued dedication to its principles and objectives, and their commitment to implement its provisions effectively.

The Final Document contains - and this is important - an agreed understanding on the prohibition of the use of herbicides as a method of warfare. This is a major issue for several countries, and covers an important dimension of the norms which will be established under the chemical weapons Convention. Had the Review Conference failed to deal adequately with this issue, significant problems could have been created in other contexts.

The Final Document also reaffirms the undertaking of all States parties to consult one another and to cooperate in solving any problems that may arise in relation to the objectives of, or in the application of the provisions of, the Convention. In this context we note that a number of States parties are

(Ms. Moules, Australia)

considering requesting the convening of a consultative committee of experts, as provided for under article V of the Convention. Australia will, of course, participate actively in such a meeting.

States parties to the ENMOD Convention are in agreement that achieving the widest possible adherence to the Convention is an important and worthy goal. Hence, in the Final Declaration the Review Conference calls upon all signatory States to ratify the Convention without delay, and upon those States which have not signed the Convention to accede to it as soon as possible. The Conference also calls upon all successor States, as appropriate, to confirm their membership or to take necessary actions to become parties to the Convention, and upon all other newly independent States to accede to the Convention.

Convinced that universal adherence to the ENMOD Convention would be a significant contribution to international confidence and to the strengthening of trust among nations, we sincerely hope that the next Review Conference will see a substantially expanded membership.

In essence, the draft resolution we are now introducing reflects the consensus views of States parties to the ENMOD Convention, as contained in the Final Document of the Second Review Conference. It is our hope that the draft resolution will be adopted by the Committee by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Mongolia to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.16.

Mr. MUNKH-ORGIL (Mongolia): On behalf of its sponsors, I have the honour to introduce today the draft resolution entitled "Disarmament Week",

(Mr. Munkh-Orgil, Mongolia)

contained in document A/C.1/47/L.16. The draft resolution is sponsored by the delegations of Afghanistan, Belarus, Canada, China, Costa Rica, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Indonesia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Malaysia, the Federated States of Micronesia, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, Samoa, Singapore, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkmenistan, Ukraine and Viet Nam.

Observed annually since 1978, Disarmament Week has contributed substantially to an increase in general public awareness of and support for the disarmament process and the role of the United Nations in this field. The Secretary-General's report, contained in document A/47/321, and the statements by the President of the General Assembly, the Secretary-General and the Chairman of this Committee at the recent special meeting of the First Committee held in observance of Disarmament Week, have proved once again that the international community continues to rely on Disarmament Week as an appropriate occasion for further promotion of national and international activities designed to educate and inform the public at large, in a balanced manner, concerning the major disarmament issues and developments.

The text of the draft resolution before us reproduces with some slight changes the text of General Assembly resolution 44/119 G, which was adopted without a vote.

In the preamble to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.16 the General Assembly would note the recent momentous developments in the world, welcome the important disarmament achievements of late, note the increasing role and prestige of the United Nations, emphasize anew the need for and the importance of world public support of disarmament efforts, recall the decisions

(Mr. Munkh-Orgil, Mongolia)

concerning Disarmament Week taken by the General Assembly at its first, second and third special sessions devoted to disarmament, and recognize the significance of the annual observance of Disarmament Week.

In the operative part of the draft resolution the General Assembly would take note with appreciation of the Secretary-General's report (A/47/321); commend all States and organizations for their support and participation in Disarmament Week; invite States that so desired to take into account the model programme for Disarmament Week, while carrying out appropriate measures; invite Governments and international and national non-governmental organizations to continue to take part in Disarmament Week; and to inform the Secretary-General of the activities undertaken; invite the Secretary-General to continue to use the United Nations information organs to promote better understanding among the world public of disarmament problems and the objectives of Disarmament Week; and decide, finally, to include in the provisional agenda of the fiftieth session of the General Assembly an item entitled "Disarmament Week".

In conclusion, I wish to express the hope of the sponsors that draft resolution A/C.I/47/L.16 will be adopted by the First Committee without a vote.

Mr. AROSEMENA ARIAS (Panama) (interpretation from Spanish): First, through you, Sir, I should like to convey to Mr. Elaraby, our Chairman and the representative of Egypt, our sincere condolences following the recent earthquake which struck his country. It is my Government's wish that Egypt may recover very soon from this tragedy.

For Panama, nuclear arms, as weapons of mass destruction, are a distinct

(Mr. Arosemena Arias, Panama)

danger to mankind and therefore to civilization, until general and complete nuclear disarmament is achieved. Within this context, there can be no justification for the use of such weapons, even as a measure of self-defence, still less, in our view, can we justify the use or threat of the use of such weapons in order to achieve political objectives. Therefore, Panama, as a party to the Treaty of Tlatelolco, supports any United Nations action which would prohibit nuclear weapons in the Western hemisphere and proposes the extension of such measures to the rest of the world.

We would like to say that we support the views of the Government of Venezuela so eloquently expressed by its representative a short while ago.

As to chemical weapons and toxic waste, my country reaffirms its position, expressed in document A/47/362, that:

> "... Panama has no institutions, facilities, equipment, matériel, laboratories or depots for the production or storage of chemical weapons or of injurious or deadly substances, munitions or devices which employ toxic agents ...". (A/47/362, p. 4)

Similarly, there are no deposits or accumulations of this kind of toxic waste.

Accordingly, Panama supports the efforts aimed at achieving a multilateral convention that would completely and effectively prohibit the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons, and that would emphasize particularly their destruction.

Similarly, the prevailing climate of political détente in international relations resulting from the end of the cold war makes very remote the possibility of a conflict which would involve the use of what has been

(Mr. Arosemena Arias, Panama)

described as "the poor man's atomic bomb", that is to say bacteriological weapons. Therefore, my country welcomes the efforts under way to control and eliminate this instrument of warfare.

(Mr. Arosemena Arias, Panama)

Much has been achieved, globally, with regard to the control and limitation of armaments. Undoubtedly, this has been one of the most encouraging results of the end of the cold war. Nevertheless, even more can be achieved in this respect and in the building of confidence between States if we bring about regional disarmament.

With the fall of the Berlin Wall and the elimination of communism in Eastern Europe, the danger of a world conflict has been reduced almost to zero. In fighting at this level it is obvious that Panama offers no threat to anyone. In my country we have to eliminate our army, inter alia by constitutional means, through a referendum to be held on 15 November next.

Nevertheless, Panama is more worried about regional conflicts that may affect it, since some countries in the area continue to have disproportionately large armed forces, to judge by their legitimate self-defence needs, both internal and external. Consequently, we are striving for regional disarmament and we appeal to the international community to attach importance to this subject, because, as we see it, this is the other aspect of the new world order.

As the President of my country, Mr. Guillermo Endara Galimany, said, at the forty-seventh session of the General Assembly, on 29 September 1992:

> "In the area of regional disarmament, Panama, under the Treaty of Tlatelolco and recent proposed amendments to it, and as a signatory to the Ayacucho Declaration, has made a commitment to cooperate in efforts in this direction, as well as in efforts to ban nuclear weapons and eliminate conventional arms in Latin America. Taking into account the concepts of peace and stability, our country has truly and effectively abolished the army and is in the process of introducing constitutional

(Mr. Arosemena Arias, Panama)

reforms that will make it impossible to re-establish any kind of military organization in Panama. If the Panamanian people supports this plan in the referendum next November, we will be - together with Costa Rica - two American countries whose constitution and laws ban the existence of an army. In this way we will have eliminated the possibility of re-establishing military regimes, of sorry memory, that did such harm throughout the history of Panama." (A/47/PV.16, p. 4)

Panama has suffered at first hand from the dangers of having an army. Our unfortunate experience of 21 years of military government has convinced us that we must eliminate all military forces and shift the economic resources intended for their maintenance to other items that will make it possible to solve problems relating to health, housing and education and to tackle the classic problems of underdevelopment, such as poverty, hunger and illiteracy.

At the forty-seventh session our Head of State made the following statement to the General Assembly:

"Both domestically and internationally, we are in favour of diverting resources that have hitherto been assigned to miliary activities towards efforts to promote the economic and social development of the people and the protection of the environment. If the great and powerful of this world have come to understand the necessity of reducing military spending, then there is even more reason for the smaller countries to understand that our wars must be wars against poverty and illiteracy. (ibid.)

(Mr. Arosemena Arias, Panama)

Attacking the problems of under-development, which have been mentioned, and at the same time preserving the constitutional arrangements for maintaining democracy, as Panama is doing right now, all this is in accordance with the redefinition of the concept of security which has emerged following the end of the cold war. This redefinition, which embraces aspects of economic and social progress, should be the common objective of the Latin American and third world countries.

Thus, we express our belief that what is known as the "peace dividend" - which we have been so anxious to bring to the attention of the major Powers - should be extended not only to the budgets of regional Powers but also to all countries. To fail to do this would be hypocrisy on a world scale. It is clear that for our peoples the reduction of military expenditures on the national or regional level is as important as doing so at the world level, if not more so.

If Panama is in the process of eliminating its army, it is in our interest for other countries in the region to do the same. If it has been possible to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones, the same could be done with regard to conventional weapons at the regional level. Efforts to bring about effective preventive diplomacy which would make it possible to solve international conflicts through dialogue, negotiation and understanding should be encouraged, with a view to abolishing once and for all the use of force in international relations. Hence any initiative relating to conventional disarmament will receive our firm support.

As a signatory of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, Panama supports the United Nations in its efforts to bring about regional disarmament.

(Mr. Arosemena Arias, Panama)

We welcome the Secretary-General's efforts to keep alive the subject of improving multilateral efforts for peace, I should like to conclude my statement by endorsing the words used in his thoughtful contribution to the new international order in his report on the work of the Organization:

"Just as today no two conflicts are the same, so the design of cooperation and the division of labour in the service of peace, stability and renewal after conflict must be approached with flexibility and creativity adapted to each particular situation. In this regard, regional arrangements and agencies have new contributions to make. (A/47/1, para. 113)

The CHAIRMAN: I shall convey to Mr. Elaraby the kind words of condolence which the representative of Panama expressed with regard to the tragic earthquake in Egypt. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I would like to inform the Committee that the following countries have joined in sponsoring the following draft resolutions:

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.8: Costa Rica, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Japan;

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9: Malaysia;

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.17: Colombia;

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.18: Costa Rica;

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.20: Norway, Greece, India; and

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.42: Japan.

The meeting rose at 11.15 a.m.

UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
24th meeting
held on
Tuesday, 3 November 1992
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 24th MEETING

Chairman:	Mr. ELARABY	(Egypt)
later:	Mr. SUH (Vice-Chairman)	(Korea)

CONTENTS

- Consideration of draft resolutions under all disarmament and international security items (continued)

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

92-61730 2547V (E)

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/47/PV.24
4 December 1992

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.25 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 49 to 65, 68 and 142; 67 and 69 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: I call the representative of Canada, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.12.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Canada): The Canadian delegation is again pleased to introduce the draft resolution entitled "Prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes". This year it is contained in document A/C.1/47/L.12 dated 28 October. The draft resolution is sponsored by Australia, Austria, the Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belarus, Botswana, Cameroon, Denmark, Finland, Indonesia, Ireland, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Philippines, Poland, Romania, the Russian Federation, Samoa, Sweden, Uruguay and Canada: a group of States from every continent.

(Mr. Robertson, Canada)

I wish to draw to the attention of representatives a number of changes that have been made in the text of this draft resolution in relation to the resolution on this subject adopted by the General Assembly at its forty-sixth session.

In addition to several purely technical updatings, the fourth preambular paragraph is new. It has been included to give appropriate recognition to important developments in the area of nuclear disarmament during the past year - both bilateral, between Russia and the United States of America, and in a series of unilateral undertakings. These developments are of relevance to the goal of prohibiting the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes and they further enhance prospects for the realization of this goal.

The fifth preambular paragraph is also new. In it the General Assembly would specifically welcome the recent decision of the United States not to produce plutonium or highly enriched uranium for nuclear explosive purposes.

Apart from these changes, the focus of this essentially procedural draft resolution remains substantively unchanged from that of its predecessors.

Canada strongly urges all delegations to lend their support to this draft resolution, which the sponsors hope might be adopted with even greater support than in the past.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Nigeria, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.5.

Mr. FASEHUN (Nigeria): It is an honour for me to introduce, on behalf of all its sponsors, draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.5, entitled "United Nations Disarmament Fellowship, Training and Advisory Services Programme". Positive changes are taking place in the international community which have made possible the achievements recorded in the area of disarmament.

(Mr. Fasehun, Nigeria)

Before the current positive developments, the United Nations, conscious of the importance of disarmament and arms control and the need to have young diplomats trained in the field of disarmament, established the United Nations disarmament fellowship, training and advisory services programme. The fellowship programme has produced 321 fellows, ex-patriots from 121 Member States, and its advisory services arm has stretched out to the regions of Africa, Asia and Latin America through the organization of regional disarmament workshops.

Most of the former fellows are among us today, while others are occupying important positions in the foreign ministries of their countries. Given its impressive record of performance and the prevailing positive international environment, the programme should continue to enjoy the full support and funding of the United Nations.

The draft resolution before the Committee is essentially the same as that of last year. However, reflecting the popularity of the programme, the number of sponsors has increased. To date we have over 38 sponsors.

In the preamble of the draft resolution the General Assembly would note with satisfaction that the programme had trained a number of public officials, and also that many officials of developing countries had acquired expertise through the training programme.

In the operative part of the draft resolution the General Assembly would express appreciation to the Member States that had rendered financial assistance to the workshops conducted under the programme.

(Mr. Fasehun, Nigeria)

Finally, I wish to take this opportunity to express our appreciation to the different Member States that have pledged their financial contributions to the advancement of the programme. It is the hope of the sponsors that the draft resolution will, as in previous years, be adopted without a vote.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Venezuela, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.34.

Mr. SALAZAR (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): This year the Venezuelan delegation has the opportunity, on behalf of its sponsors, to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.34 on item 58 of the agenda of the General Assembly, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space". The sponsors of the draft resolution are: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Ireland, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mexico, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Ukraine, Viet Nam, and my own delegation, Venezuela.

These delegations consider it necessary to continue the in-depth bilateral and multilateral efforts to achieve the objective of the peaceful use of outer space and to prevent the arms race from spreading to space.

Although profound changes have taken place in the world, interest in the research and development of defensive systems which could be placed in outer space seems to be continuing unabated. The great resources spent on this objective and the qualitative improvement of certain arms systems show that the use of outer space could become, if it is not already, a serious risk to collective security.

(Mr. Salazar, Venezuela)

This tendency, without a doubt, raises the possibility that this geographical environment will become a further theatre for strategic and military competition. The inadequacy of the existing legal regime applicable to space is not the best guarantee of the preservation of this environment for exclusively peaceful purposes. The search for juridical norms to prevent the transferring of the arms race to outer space remains an item of primary importance on the disarmament agenda.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.34, which we are introducing today, follows the general lines of last year's General Assembly resolution 46/33. However, there have been some changes such as the reference to the Final Declaration adopted by the Tenth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Jakarta in September 1992, and emphasis on the need for greater transparency and better information on the part of the international community regarding the use of outer space.

The delegations of Egypt, Sri Lanka and Venezuela have carried out consultations with certain States and groups of States with a view to soliciting suggestions for improving the draft resolution this year.

Before concluding, I should like to emphasize the participation of new delegations in sponsoring draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.34. This shows how important the prevention of an arms race in outer space is for the security of States Members of the United Nations in the present international context, which is characterized by the many innovations and advances in the scientific and technological field.

This draft resolution then stresses the need for the adoption of additional legal instruments to make up for the inadequacies of the current

(Mr. Salazar, Venezuela)

legislation on space and, to a certain extent, seeks to meet the concerns of those States and, the international community in this regard.

Mr. NEAGU (Romania): As Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space at this year's session of the Conference on Disarmament, I feel morally bound to join the sponsors of the draft resolution just introduced by the representative of Venezuela on the continuation of efforts at the Conference to achieve the objective of ensuring the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

(Mr. Neagu, Romania)

In accordance with the mandate given to it by the Conference on Disarmament, the Ad Hoc Committee continued, during its session this year, to examine and, by substantive and general consideration, to identify issues relevant to the prevention of an arms race in outer space, taking into account the existing agreements, as well as the relevant proposals, initiatives and developments since the establishment of the Committee in 1985.

During the deliberations it was normal for different - sometimes even opposing - views to be expressed. However, as is underlined in the report of the Conference on Disarmament that is under consideration, the Committee made progress in its efforts to identify areas of convergence suitable for more structured work.

But much remains to be done to prevent an arms race in outer space. Therefore, the Conference decided to re-establish the Ad Hoc Committee on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space, with an adequate mandate, at the beginning of its 1993 session, taking into account all relevant factors, including the work done by the Committee since 1985.

My delegation believes that the content of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.34 will encourage the Conference on Disarmament to continue its endeavours to extend areas of convergence, taking into account relevant proposals and initiatives, including those put forward by the Ad Hoc Committee at the 1992 session of the Conference and those put forward at this session of the General Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Mexico, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.37.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): The question of a comprehensive ban on nuclear-weapon tests has been on the agenda of the First Committee for almost four decades, and the General Assembly has adopted some 80 resolutions on the subject. This is compelling evidence of the importance that the international community attaches to the subject and of the assiduity with which the General Assembly has pursued this goal.

For many years the First Committee considered two draft resolutions on the subject. Last year, however, the delegations of Australia, New Zealand and Mexico succeeded in having the two drafts merged, and today, for the second year in succession, Mexico has the honour of presenting a single draft resolution, which is contained in document A/C.1/47/L.37. The draft resolution is sponsored by the 66 States listed in that document and by Germany.

As they indicate in the preamble to the draft resolution, the sponsors are convinced that the possibility of securing a treaty prohibiting all nuclear tests increased substantially in 1992. After recalling the various resolutions on the subject and stressing the priority attached to them, we reiterate our conviction

"that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought".

In this draft resolution, as in resolution 46/29 of 1992, the General Assembly welcomes

"the improved relationship between the Russian Federation and the United States of America and their consequent announcements of significant measures, including unilateral steps, which could signal the reversal of the nuclear-arms race",

(Mr. Marín Bosch, Mexico)

as well as

> "the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, signed on 31 July 1991, and the signing of a protocol to this Treaty in which Belarus, Kazakhstan, the Russian Federation, Ukraine and the United States of America undertake to give effect to the Treaty"

and

> "the Joint Understanding of 17 June 1992 between the Russian Federation and the United States of America on further reductions in their strategic offensive arms".

Other preambular paragraphs make reference to unilateral measures adopted by three of the nuclear-weapon States: the decision of the Russian Federation to extend its moratorium on nuclear testing; the decision of France to suspend its testing of nuclear weapons for 1992; and the recent decision of the United States to implement a testing moratorium accompanied by a plan to achieve a multilateral, comprehensive ban on the testing of nuclear weapons. The draft resolution also endorses the call made by France and by the Russian Federation on the other nuclear Powers to suspend their nuclear tests.

The draft resolution reiterates the conviction

> "that an end to nuclear testing by all States in all environments for all time is an essential step in order to prevent the qualitative improvement and development of nuclear weapons and their further proliferation and to contribute, along with other concurrent efforts to reduce nuclear arms, to the eventual elimination of nuclear weapons".

Reference is made also to the environmental and health risks associated with underground nuclear testing, and there is explicit reference to an expert

(Mr. Marín Bosch, Mexico)

study on these questions - which is contained document CD/1167 - prepared under the auspices of the Norwegian Government. In this regard, the Assembly would welcome

"the statement of the Russian Federation, when announcing its nuclear-testing moratorium decision on 26 October 1991, which noted, inter alia, the environmental benefits and economic savings to be derived".

In this draft resolution the General Assembly would also reiterate its conviction

"that the most effective way to achieve an end to nuclear testing is through the conclusion, at an early date, of a verifiable, comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty that will attract the adherence of all States",

and it refers to undertakings entered into in this regard by the original parties to the partial test-ban Treaty of 1963 and the non-proliferation Treaty of 1968. It notes with satisfaction the work done by the Group of Scientific Experts in Geneva, and it recalls the process initiated a few years ago to amend the 1963 Treaty.

The preamble concludes with an expression of

"disappointment that the Conference on Disarmament was unable to re-establish the Ad Hoc Committee on item 1 of its agenda, entitled 'Nuclear test ban', despite the improved political climate".

The operative part of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.37 consists of eight paragraphs, according to which the General Assembly:

"1. Reaffirms its conviction that a treaty to achieve the prohibition of all nuclear-test explosions by all States in all environments for all time is a matter of priority which would constitute

(Mr. Marín Bosch, Mexico)

an essential step in order to prevent the qualitative improvement and development of nuclear weapons and their further proliferation, and which would contribute to the process of nuclear disarmament;

(Mr Marín Bosch, Mexico)

"2. Urges, therefore, all States to seek to achieve the early discontinuance of all nuclear-test explosions for all time;

"3. Urges:

"(a) The nuclear-weapon States to agree promptly to appropriate verifiable and militarily significant interim measures, with a view to concluding a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty;

"(b) Those nuclear-weapon States which have not yet done so to adhere to the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapons Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water;

"4. Reaffirms the particular responsibilities of the Conference on Disarmament in the negotiation of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty, and, in this context, urges the re-establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban in 1993;

"5. Requests the Conference on Disarmament, in this context, to intensify its substantive work begun in 1990 on specific and interrelated test-ban issues, including structure and scope and verification and compliance, taking also into account all relevant proposals and future initiatives;

"6. Urges the Conference on Disarmament:

"(a) To take into account the progress achieved by the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Cooperative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events, including the experience gained from the technical test concerning the global exchange and analysis of seismic data, and other relevant initiatives;

"(b) To continue efforts to establish, with the widest possible participation, an international seismic monitoring network with a view to

(Mr Marín Bosch, Mexico)

developing further a system for the effective monitoring and verification of compliance with a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty;

"(c) To investigate other measures to monitor and verify compliance with such a treaty, including on-site inspections, satellite monitoring, and an international network to monitor atmospheric radioactivity;

"7. Calls upon the Conference on Disarmament to report to the General Assembly at its forty-eighth session on progress made, including its recommendations on how the objectives of the Ad Hoc Committee on agenda item 1 entitled "Nuclear test ban" should be carried forward most effectively towards achieving a comprehensive test-ban treaty;"

"8. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its forty-eighth session the item entitled 'Comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty'."

The sponsors of the draft resolution hope that it will receive the firm support of the members of the First Committee and then of the General Assembly. In this way the United Nations will be issuing an unequivocable message on the importance that it attaches to the prompt conclusion of a treaty designed to achieve a ban on all nuclear-test explosions by all States in all environments and for all time. A comprehensive test-ban treaty is a necessary step in achieving a less insecure world and a universal system for ensuring nuclear non-proliferation.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN (Australia): I am pleased to take the floor to speak in support of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.37, just introduced by the representative of Mexico. I should like to take this opportunity to thank him for his consistent support for the objectives of this draft resolution and in particular this year for his leadership of the efforts to develop as wide support as possible for it.

(Mr. O'Sullivan, Australia)

This draft resolution is a successor to the merged resolution of 1991 - resolution 46/29 - introduced by New Zealand, which for the first time allowed the international community to express in one voice its hopes for an end to nuclear testing. This year that objective can be repeated more strongly because of the significant evolution that has taken place: the foreshadowed sharp unilateral cuts by the largest possessors of nuclear weapons in the numbers of such weapons and agreement to cut deeply into the most threatening and destabilizing elements of their nuclear arsenals.*

As the military utility of nuclear weapons has come under increasing question, the need for testing to develop or modernize nuclear warheads has disappeared. The arguments for testing, which are based on concerns regarding safety and reliability, are questioned within the scientific and technical community. So the stage is set now for the international community to move forward on one of the great long-sought disarmament objectives: an end to the testing of nuclear weapons in all environments and for all time. We now have moratoriums in place in four of the five nuclear-weapon States. We call on the last remaining nuclear-testing power - China - to join the others in exercising restraint. And we call on all five nuclear-weapon States to convert testing moratoriums into a permanent ban.

The way that conversion should be done is through the elaboration of a multilateral treaty in the Conference on Disarmament. The Conference on Disarmament has over the years completed a lot of work on aspects of a comprehensive test-ban treaty, inter alia through the provision by Member States of draft texts of a treaty. I thank the delegations of Russia and Sweden for those contributions.

---

* Mr, Suh (Republic of Korea), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

(Mr. O'Sullivan, Australia)

Disarmament has over the years completed a lot of work on aspects of a comprehensive test-ban treaty, inter alia through the provision by Member States of draft texts of a treaty. I thank the delegations of Russia and Sweden for those contributions.

Taking into account all recent developments on the nuclear testing front, Australia considers that it would be useful to submit ideas on elements of a comprehensive test-ban treaty to the Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty in the course of its work programme next year. Australia intends to provide such elements for the consideration of the international community. These elements will take close account of the work already done in the Conference on Disarmament, the existing law and practice relating to the monitoring and regulation of nuclear testing and of course input, both technical and otherwise, from the testing States themselves.

In developing ideas on how to monitor a comprehensive test ban treaty, the work done by the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to consider International Cooperative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events on its second major technical test (GSETT-2) and their subsequent report to the Conference on Disarmament are important contributions. We would like to encourage the participation of more States in the work of the Group of Experts. As the possibility of a comprehensive test-ban treaty increases, we hope the work of providing input into seismic and other aspects of verification will also increase.

Australia believes that the international community has now, for the first time since President Eisenhower called for a comprehensive test ban in March 1960, a real opportunity to put into place a long-sought disarmament goal. We acknowledge that a nuclear-test ban will require careful and

(Mr. O'Sullivan, Australia)

judicious thought and detailed negotiation. It will, like the chemical weapons Convention, demand a mixture of technical expertise and political judgement. It will also need a measure of determination and goodwill from all negotiators. The achievement of a chemical weapons Convention should give us heart that we are now in an international environment in which such outcomes are available. We believe that a comprehensive test-ban treaty should be achieved, or nearly so, by the time that the extension Conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons is held in March 1995.

Mr. RICHARDS (New Zealand): I am pleased to speak today in support of the draft resolution on a comprehensive test-ban treaty (A/C.1/47/L.37), just introduced by the representative of Mexico and supported by the representative of Australia.

The representative of Mexico has provided a detailed commentary on the text, which I will not repeat. Nor do I want to reiterate New Zealand's views on the importance of a comprehensive test-ban treaty, views which the Permanent Representative of New Zealand placed on record in his statement to the Committee on 15 October. However, I should like to offer a few comments on some of the considerations taken into account in drawing up the draft resolution before us this year.

Last year, for the first time in nearly twenty years, this Committee was presented with a single draft resolution on a comprehensive test-ban treaty. As resolution 46/29, that text received overwhelming support from the General Assembly.

(Mr. Richards, New Zealand)

New Zealand was proud to have sponsored that resolution. We are also pleased that the hopes expressed therein for further reductions in nuclear arsenals have been fulfilled. In 1992 we have all applauded measures signalling the reversal of the nuclear arms race.

The year 1992 has also seen increasing momentum towards a comprehensive test-ban treaty. According to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.37, the General Assembly would acknowledge and welcome significant steps taken in recent months by the nuclear-weapon States, the majority of whom have now suspended testing for specified periods. Compared with last year, more than half as many States again have sponsored the text. This can be taken as a measure of the strengthening expectation of the world community that nuclear testing should be halted once and for all.

The climate for progress has never been more propitious. It should be possible to negotiate a comprehensive test-ban treaty over the next few years without compromising the security interests of the nuclear-weapon States. Such an achievement would greatly strengthen international efforts with a view to non-proliferation, which is regarded by many, including my Government, as the major security problem facing the post-cold-war world.

In bringing to this Committee, at this session, draft Convention on chemical weapons, the Conference on Disarmament has justified the faith placed in it as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum. In draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.37 the Assembly would call upon the Conference on Disarmament to build upon that success and decide how it could most effectively work towards its objective of a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

(Mr. Richards, New Zealand)

Support for the text before us will signal to the Conference on Disarmament that the international community is behind it as it begins its 1993 work. It will demonstrate the existence of the political will that is so essential if that work is to be carried towards a successful conclusion.

New Zealand commends the draft resolution to all members.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon the representative of Peru, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.6.

Mr. VASQUEZ (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation has the honour of introducing the draft resolution entitled "Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons: 1995 Conference and its Preparatory Committee", issued under the symbol A/C.1/47/L.6.

Peru, as Chairman of the Fourth Amendment Conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), convened here at Headquarters the States Parties to that international instrument with a view to achieving a consensus agreement on the beginning of the work of the Preparatory Committee for the 1995 Conference. That agreement is contained in the draft resolution which my delegation is introducing.

According to this draft resolution, the General Aassembly would recall its resolution 2373 (XXII) of 12 June 1968, the annex to which contains the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. It would note the provisions of article X, paragraph 2, of that Treaty, requiring the holding of a conference 25 years after the entry into force of the Treaty to decide whether the Treaty should continue in force indefinitely or should be extended for an additional fixed period.

(Mr. Vasquez, Peru)

The Assembly would also note the provisions of article VIII, paragraph 3, of the Treaty, concerning the convening of review conferences, and would note further that the last Review Conference took place in 1990. It would recall that the Treaty entered into force on 5 March 1970, and would further recall decision 46/413 of 6 December 1991, approved by consensus at the forty-sixth session of the General Assembly.

In the operative part, the General Assembly would take note of the fact that the parties to the Treaty, following appropriate consultations, had decided to form a Preparatory Committee for a Conference in 1995 to review the operation of the Treaty and to decide on its extension, as provided for in article VIII, paragraph 3, and in article X, paragraph 2.

The General Assembly would also note that the Preparatory Committee would be open to all parties to the Treaty and, if that Committee so decided at the outset of its first session, also to States not parties as observers, and that the Preparatory Committee would hold its first meeting in New York from 10 to 14 May 1993.

Finally, the Assembly would request the Secretary-General to render the necessary assistance and to provide such services as might be required, including summary records, for the 1995 Conference and its preparatory committee.

In view of the process which led to the agreement contained in the draft resolution which I am introducing, and the fact that it was adopted by consensus, my delegation hopes that this draft resolution will be adopted without a vote.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon the Secretary of the Committee to make a statement.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I would like to inform the Committee that the following States have become co-sponsors of the following draft resolutions:

A/C.1/47/L.5: Algeria, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Mongolia, Namibia, Russian Federation, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania and the United States of America;

A/C.1/47/L.15: Bulgaria, Belgium, Romania and Costa Rica;

A/C.1/47/L.18: Singapore;

A/C.1/47/L.20: Costa Rica and Democratic People's Republic of Korea;

A/C.1/47/L.21: Costa Rica;

A/C.1/47/L.24: Kuwait;

A/C.1/47/L.26: Costa Rica;

A/C.1/47/L.29: Costa Rica;

A/C.1/47/L.33: Democratic People's Republic of Korea;

A/C.1/47/L.35: Kuwait and Zambia;

A/C.1/47/L.37: Germany, United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia;

A/C.1/47/L.38: Islamic Republic of Iran;

A/C.1/47/L.39: Costa Rica;

A/C.1/47/L.41: Democratic People's Republic of Korea;

A/C.1/47/L.42: Belgium and Norway.

The meeting rose at 11.10 a.m.